

# AI Planning

## Exercise Sheet 5

Date: 27.11.2014

Students: Axel Perschmann, Tarek Saier

### Exercise 5.1

As given in the lecture slides:

Proof by induction over the structure of  $\chi$ .

Base case  $\chi = \top$ : then  $s' \models \top$ .

Base case  $\chi = \perp$ : then  $s \not\models \perp$ .

Base case  $\chi = a \in A$ : assume  $s \models a$  and  $on(s) \subseteq on(s')$ .

Wich  $a \in on(s)$  we get  $a \in on(s')$ , hence  $s' \models a$ .

Inductive case  $\chi = \chi_1 \wedge \chi_2$

$$\begin{aligned}
 s \models \chi &\iff s \models \chi_1 \wedge \chi_2 \\
 &\iff s \models \chi_1 \text{ and } s \models \chi_2 \\
 &\implies s' \models \chi_1 \text{ and } s' \models \chi_2 \\
 &\iff s' \models \chi_1 \text{ and } s' \models \chi_2 \\
 &\iff s' \models \chi
 \end{aligned}$$

Inductive case  $\chi = \chi_1 \vee \chi_2$  (Analogous to previous case)

$$\begin{aligned}
 s \models \chi &\iff s \models \chi_1 \vee \chi_2 \\
 &\iff s \models \chi_1 \text{ or } s \models \chi_2 \\
 &\implies s' \models \chi_1 \text{ or } s' \models \chi_2 \\
 &\iff s' \models \chi_1 \text{ or } s' \models \chi_2 \\
 &\iff s' \models \chi
 \end{aligned}$$

### Exercise 5.2

(a)  $\Pi^+ = \langle A, I, O, \gamma \rangle$  with  $A, I, \gamma$  unchanged and

$$\begin{aligned}
 O &= \{eatCake^+, bakeCake^+\} \\
 eatCake^+ &= \langle haveCake, \top \wedge haveNoCake \wedge eatenCake \rangle \\
 bakeCake^+ &= \langle haveNoCake, haveCake \wedge \top \rangle
 \end{aligned}$$

(b)  $\pi = bakeCake, eatCake$

$\pi$  in  $\Pi$  results in  $\{haveCake \mapsto 0, eatenCake \mapsto 1, haveNoCake \mapsto 1\}$

$\pi^+$  in  $\Pi^+$  results in  $\{haveCake \mapsto 1, eatenCake \mapsto 1, haveNoCake \mapsto 1\}$

### Exercise 5.3

Considerations:

$h^{Manhattan}(s)$  sums up distances of tiles to their target position.

$h^+(s)$  considers the relaxed planning task with relaxed operators. This means when a tile is moved it moves to the new position but also "stays" at the old ( $at()$  for the old position is not negated).  $\chi$  of each  $o^+$  should be the same in  $\Pi$  and  $\Pi^+$  though.

(a)

$h^{Manhattan}(s)$  is equal to  $h^+(s)$  without the restrictions given by  $\chi$  for each  $o^+$ . In other words: for  $h^{Manhattan}(s)$  you can move any tile freely, for  $h^+(s)$  you can move tiles freely along the paths where  $empty(p_{i,j})$  was made true at one point or was true for  $s$  in the first place. Therefore  $h^{Manhattan}(s)$  can never yield a larger number than  $h^+(s)$ .

(b)

$$s = \begin{array}{cccc} t_0 & t_1 & t_2 & t_3 \\ t_4 & t_5 & t_6 & t_7 \\ t_8 & t_9 & t_{10} & t_{11} \\ t_{14} & t_{13} & t_{12} & - \end{array}$$

$$h^{Manhattan}(s) = (|0 - 2| + |3 - 3|) + (|2 - 0| + |3 - 3|) = 4$$

$h^+(s) = 7$  with plan:

$move(t_{12}, p_{2,3}, p_{3,3})$

$move(t_{13}, p_{1,3}, p_{2,3})$

$move(t_{14}, p_{0,3}, p_{1,3})$

$move(t_{14}, p_{1,3}, p_{2,3})$

$move(t_{12}, p_{3,3}, p_{2,3})$

$move(t_{12}, p_{2,3}, p_{1,3})$

$move(t_{12}, p_{1,3}, p_{0,3})$